UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Correctional Institution and Personal Adjustment - - *Richard A. McGee*

Some Meditations on Visiting the Fair - - - - - - - *A. Powell Davies*

"Union Now"—of How Many? - - - - - - - - - *Henry W. Pinkham*

Pioneering in Religious Thinking - - - - - - - - - *John H. Hershey*

Horse Sense - - - *May Stranathan*

The Study Table

VOLUME CXXIII NUMBER 11

Chicago, August 7, 1939

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES F. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 163

ARTICLES—
The Correctional Institution and Personal Adjustment—RICHARD A. MCGEE 166
Some Meditations on Visiting the Fair. I—Man Is a Maker of Things—A. POWELL DAVIES 168
"Union Now"—of How Many?—HENRY W. PINKHAM 170
Pioneering in Religious Thinking—JOHN H. HERSHEY 171
Horse Sense—MAY STRANATHAN 173

POETRY—
America's Lost Song—HELEN KIMBERLY MCELHONE 165
Rainier—HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER 169
When Nights Are Dark—RITA KISSIN 170

THE STUDY TABLE—
Vital Theatre—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 174

CORRESPONDENCE—
Coughlin and the Catholic Church—BLANCHE WATSON 176
Commenting on Our July 3d Issue—FLORENCE HOGE 176
"The Gift of Prophecy"—MADISON COOPER 176
The Hem and Haw Club—R. W. 176

THE FIELD—
Death of a Liberal—*New York Times* 162

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Death of a Liberal

An almost forgotten Serbian patriot and statesman died recently during a political meeting in Ochrida, on the shores of a lake in South Serbia where the frontiers of Greece, Albania and Yugoslavia meet. Although Jovan Jovanovitch was once Serbian Minister in Washington, his name means little in the United States. In recent years it counted for little even in his own country, for it stood for a liberal tradition more representative of a former generation than of the Balkan leaders of today. Yet it is a name which figures prominently in the history of an epoch very like the present. Jovan Jovanovitch was one of the dramatis personae in the tragic prologue to the World War. He was Serbian Minister to Vienna in the fateful Summer of 1914. The ultimatum which started the war was delivered to him, but if his advice had been followed, there might have been no ultimatum and no war. Overstepping diplomatic etiquette, he begged the Austrian Government not to send Franz Ferdinand on the visit to Sarajevo which ended in his assassination.

After the war, Jovanovitch fought consistently to widen the bases of democratic government in his country. As soon as victorious Serbia became the head of the enlarged kingdom of Yugoslavia, he was foremost among the few farsighted Serbs who worked for a reconciliation with the Croats. He died before his hope of equality in unity was realized, and the saddest commentary on his life and death is that as he grew older he was progressively lonelier in the liberal views and democratic ideals he cherished to the last. His was the tragedy of many of the elder statesmen who led the fight for national independence twenty-five years ago; the "new Europe" they envisioned has assumed a shape so different from their dream.

But it is significant that men like Jovan Jovanovitch do not give up the dreams. Just as the only nations that have surrendered freedom are the nations who never really experienced it, so all over Europe the old liberals remain liberals, unshaken in their faith by the current waves of reaction.

New York Times.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIII MONDAY, AUGUST 7, 1939 No. 11

THE RULE OF LIFE

I, therefore, Callicles, am persuaded by these accounts, and consider how I may exhibit my soul before the judge in a healthy condition. Wherefore, disregarding the honors that most men value, and looking to the truth, I shall endeavor in reality to live as virtuously as I can; and, when I die, to die so. And I invite all other men, to the utmost of my power; and you, too, I in turn invite to this contest, which, I affirm, surpasses all contests here.

Socrates (Plato)

THE NEUTRALITY SITUATION

The administration's most smashing defeat since the Senate's repudiation of the Supreme Court packing plan was registered last month in the refusal of the Senate to pass the Roosevelt-Hull revision of the Neutrality Law, an event forecast by the rebellion of the House on the same issue. This event is immensely heartening, and enormously significant. For let no one misinterpret what took place on Capitol Hill! It was no Republican partisan conspiracy which defeated this White House measure. More Democrats lined up against it than Republicans! It was no uprising of reactionary business and political interests against a hated President. These very interests, especially as voiced by the reactionary press, were all in favor of lifting the ammunition embargo, just as Mr. Roosevelt proposed. The final credit cannot be assigned even to that heroic little group of Senatorial leaders, headed by Mr. Borah, who with resolute determination fronted the President with an absolute refusal to bow to his arrogant will. "The United States is not operating under Hitler," said the Idaho senator. What happened is to be explained in terms of as splendid an expression of the popular will as this country has seen in years. A great majority of Congressmen in House and Senate do not thus act in opposition to a popular President when their constituents are all for the President! No, on this issue the masses of the people were against the President. Their one desire these days is for peace. And with hardheaded common sense they knew that the President's proposal endangered peace. On the President's own say-so, the repeal of the embargo meant just one thing—the definite alignment of the United States with one of the two parties to the struggle of power politics now going on in Europe. It was to put America into the war before the war came. To call this "neutrality," or "peace," is only one more deliberate misuse of words for which the Roosevelt administration has been notorious from the beginning. In this struggle, in which a determined President was so determinedly defeated, a great and immediate danger was escaped. But the danger itself remains. Mr. Roosevelt, for motives which we may concede to be honorable, is hot to get us into the European embroilment. He desires nothing quite so much as what Woodrow Wilson before him desired—to end his career as a world dictator in issues of war and peace. One experience of that kind, we opine, is quite enough!

HAS RELIGION QUITE DISAPPEARED?

It is interesting to read Professor and Mrs. Charles A. Beard's recent history, *America in Mid-Passage,* and note the complete and perfect way in which the authors ignore religion and the church. This work in survey of American life during the past ten years is remarkable for its comprehensiveness. There is ample mention, of course, of politics and business, of the Depression and the New Deal, but this by no means to the exclusion of other matters. On the contrary, there are whole chapters devoted to labor and agriculture, to the movie, the radio, the theatre, and literature, to science and art. Education, journalism, social welfare work, the army and navy, transportation, trade, invention and foreign travel, all are studied and described extensively. It seems as though nothing were omitted from this elaborate picture of contemporary American thought and life—until you suddenly remember religion, and of this there is practically nothing. In all these more than nine hundred crowded pages, we have found the name of only one Christian minister (included casually in a list of citizens signing a certain public statement!) and discovered only a single mention of the church as an institution (this in connection with a discussion of the morals of the movies!). Is it possible that organized Christianity has so completely disappeared as a living influence in American society? Does the membership in churches, Catholic and Protestant, of more than fifty million people, the expenditure each year for religious purposes of hundreds of millions of dollars, the presence of 150,000 clergymen and priests, the work of great organizations like the Federal Council of Churches, the leadership of such

men as Harry Emerson Fosdick, Harry F. Ward, Bishop McConnell, and of such journals as the *Christian Century,* the *Christian Advocate,* the *Churchman*—does all this mean nothing? Or are the Beards simply ignorant of one great and vital force in American life, and thus incompetent historians? The answer is easy! The Beards, like many other so-called students of the times, simply do not know what is going on.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN AMERICA

Religious liberty in this country is guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution. The guaranty, however, is never completely effective. Intolerance, like a foul serpent, is always creeping in to work havoc. At the present time, conditions are pretty good, in spite of much talk of anti-Semitism and of the bitter mouthings of men like Father Coughlin and Fritz Kuhn, as is shown in a sweeping survey and report just published by the American Civil Liberties Union in New York. Intolerance here at home is on the wane at the very time when it is raging like a forest fire abroad. Our absence of bigotry is perhaps a reaction upon and therefore a result of what is going on in Europe. Something like the typical American spirit, as we like to think of it, has risen up in horror and revolt against the imprisonment of Martin Niemoeller, the abuse of the Catholic Archbishop of Vienna, the ferocities of persecution in Spain. We want nothing of this sort within our borders. Yet we are not guiltless of offense, as the Civil Liberties report makes plain. Thus, in spite of the first amendment, there are several states of the Union which impose religious tests for public office. In certain states the teaching of evolution is repugnant to Fundamentalists and is banished from the public schools. Children of the Church of Jehovah's Witnesses, forbidden by their parents to salute the flag as an idolatrous act, are expelled from the schools, with the sanction even of the courts. Military training in schools and colleges, teachers' oaths laws, and kindred matters, all enter into the field of religious liberty, as witness the convictions of the noble Society of Friends. And always, in this age, there is the fundamental spiritual question of conscientious objection to war! All these violations of principle are holes in the dike of religious freedom in America. They should be closed—and the dike patroled day and night by the guardians of liberty, that in these troublous days, bigotry and hate may not seep in upon us. It is the old story, again, of "eternal vigilance."

RELIGION AND THE RADIO

The National Association of Broadcasters has adopted a new code for the control of the air. It is on the whole a good code, especially in its definition of ideals for children's programs, and more especially for its insistence upon free and equal opportunity for all parties in the discussion of controversial public issues. But the paragraph on religious broadcasts raises questions! This paragraph reads:

> Radio, which reaches men of all creeds and races simultaneously, may not be used to convey attacks upon another's race or religion. Rather it should be the purpose of the religious broadcast to promote the spiritual harmony and understanding of mankind and to administer broadly to the varied religious needs of the community.

Now, what is to be the interpretation of these words? Do they mean that, if given an opportunity to speak upon the air, we shall not be allowed to attack Father Coughlin's religion of bigotry and hate, as his co-religionist, John A. Lapp, attacked him the other day (see UNITY, July 3, page 133)? Or—to drive this nail home!—do they mean that Father Coughlin himself is going to be silenced? We have not the slightest sympathy with the Detroit priest, as our readers well know; we recognize the menace of his work, and fear it. But still we believe it a violation of principles of liberty in America to silence even him. Our business is not to silence him, but to answer him. Or, to cite other illustrations! Is the radio, under this new code, to deny to any one of us the right to criticize, or attack the Pope's blessing on General Franco, or what seems to be the Methodists' infringement of Negro rights in their recent accomplishment of church union? Is there henceforth to be no frank and free discussion on the air of the Oxford Group Movement, or similar controversial bodies in the religious field? And what about this idea that "the purpose of the religious broadcast" is "to promote the spiritual harmony . . . of mankind"? How much "harmony" did the great prophets of religion promote in their day? Amos, for example, or Jesus, or Martin Luther? Try to think, if you can, of Theodore Parker adapting his preaching to this "purpose"! To "administer broadly to the varied religious needs of the community" and thus to "promote spiritual harmony and understanding" is lovely, but it may in the end emasculate true religion of all its potency. When we study this code, and then survey the World's Fair "Temple of Religion" with its central policy of "hush-hush," we wonder if we are not coming to a time when religion will "signify nothing," and not even have "sound and fury" to justify its existence.

A PRAYER THAT MEANT SOMETHING

Here is a story worth recording—of a Senate chaplain who offered up a prayer that was heard by senators as well as by the Lord! The scene was not the United States Senate, but the Senate of the State of Wisconsin, and the chaplain was a minister, the Reverend Allen L. Eddy, Congregationalist, of Madison, who had been invited to open the session with prayer. Usually the chaplain's prayers are terrible affairs—a few doorkeepers and clerks in attendance, with a scattered two or three senators, and a petition which is the essence of innocuous conventionality. Nobody listens, for nobody expects to hear anything worth listening to. But this time it was different! Here was a min-

ister who believed that religion should have something to do with life, and prayer with the occasion of its utterance. So, to the horror of all auditors, there came from the chaplain's lips an invitation for the visitation of divine wrath "upon all betrayers of the people who seek to corrupt public officials, and upon little men in large places who stoop to canny shrewdness to thwart a people's will and reduce the business of public affairs to mistrust and contempt." Well, were those senators mad? They certainly were—for reasons obvious to any freshman student of psychology! And straightway they rose up in their wrath, these senators did, and ordered this minister's name to be stricken from the list of local ministers who might fulfill the chaplain's functions. This took away his fee—which was the most dire punishment of which these sensitive legislators could think. But this is not the end of the story. Not by a long shot! For this minister, who had prayed like a modern Amos, belongs to a Ministers Association in Madison, and this Ministers Association has evidently learned something from the history of trade unionism. For, on hearing of the Senate's action against their brother, the Association went on strike—i. e., it voted that unless its members shall have freedom of speech, they will not any one of them serve the Senate. Which means that the Senate will have to go without prayers, unless it can find some "scabs" to address the Lord! Perhaps this is just as well, for the chances are that the Wisconsin senators are beyond praying for anyhow.

HAVELOCK ELLIS

Havelock Ellis, dead on July 19th last, belonged to the great order of Darwin and Spencer. He was a gatherer and investigator of facts, and the proclaimer of the new truth contained in facts. As Darwin opened up the question of vital origins, and encountered the misunderstanding and bitter hostility of the church in its dogma of divine creation, so Ellis opened up the question of sex, and encountered the furious opposition of a society whose moral standards were fixed on the taboo of all sexual discussion or even knowledge. In these days, of which Havelock Ellis was himself the heroic pioneer, it is well-nigh impossible to conceive of the intolerance and hatred that broke upon this patient man as the profaner of some hidden and sacred holy of holy. More than any one man, for years single-handed and alone, Ellis beat down the barriers of superstition, prudery, shame, and false morality which hedged about this problem of sex. Happily it was his privilege to live to see his labors yield their fruit, and a whole new age of sanity and enlightenment ushered in. But Havelock Ellis was more than scientist and moralist in the field of sex, as Spencer in the field of evolution. He was what Spencer never was—an artist of keenest sensibility and supremely beautiful expression. He wrote books which in his own lifetime became classics—notably his *The Dance of Life,* which was a statement of his philosophy in terms of the aesthetics of music, dancing and poetry. As an instance of a work in which science, morals, and art seemed to unite in lovely combination, we would name his modest volume entitled, *Little Essays of Love and Virtue.* Ellis, like Darwin, was the most modest and retiring of men. In all the long period when public wrath ran high against him, when his books were banned and his very name was a hissing and a by-word, he remained serenely quiet, leaving time to fight his battles and win his victory. He never made a speech nor appeared in public, but wrote unceasingly with his potent pen. He bore the mein and stature of an ancient prophet, his presense seeming the very witness of his purity of heart and beauty of spirit. Few men in any time have so changed the thoughts and customs of mankind. His fame is sure.

America's Lost Song

"I hear America singing."—Walt Whitman

I hear America building;
What does America build,
Homes for her homeless children?
No, weapons to have them killed.

I hear America planning;
What does she plan today?
Saving the Youth of Nations?
No, plans to throw them away.

I hear America spending;
For what does America spend,
For a land filled with joy and singing?
No, a land where all singing must end.

I hear America calling,
Calling as if in pain;
Calling the good grey poet
To start her singing again.

I hear America praying;
With her lads lying over the sea
Under millions of stark wooden crosses:—
God, what will the answer be?

. . . . . .

I hear America breaking
Out of her nightmare clod;
I hear America singing,—
"PEACE" is the answer of God.

Helen Kimberly McElhone

The Correctional Institution and Personal Adjustment*

RICHARD A. McGEE

Every organization which deals with human beings must meet certain problems involved in aiding in or influencing the adjustment of people. This is true of the kindergarten, and the Woolworth store. It is also just as true of the Bengal Lancers or the State Prison. In the home we call it behavior; in elementary school, deportment; in secondary schools, it is guidance; in industry, personnel management; in the army, discipline; in the social agency, case work; in medicine, it is therapy, and in modern prisons, just to be different, we call it classification and treatment.

Why are we all so interested in guiding, steering, adjusting, directing, and making over other people's lives? After all maybe some of them like being the way they are and even if they do not what guaranty is there that we who perhaps have not done too well with our own lives can do much about it.

There is a sound answer to "why" but not a very complete one as to "how." The need for adjustment arises when an individual is maladjusted to some portion or all of the circumstances under which he must live and work. He is analogous to a gear out of mesh with the related gears in the same machine. Such a gear will be either a useless idler or, if sufficiently misplaced, may strip its own teeth and those adjacent to it. It might even cause the complete ruin of the machine of which it is a part.

Frankly, maladjusted persons are important to the rest of us because we are a part of the same machine —the machine called society. That machine in the year 1939 is badly in need of repair. Perhaps it needs some redesigning but, worst of all, about one-third of its human parts need readjustment if not replacement.

The best time to readjust a machine part is before it is too badly damaged. In present-day society this is the job of schools, hospitals, families, crime prevention programs, churches, housing authorities, relief agencies, and similar social institutions. The penal or correctional institution is the agency of last resort—or at least it should be. These institutions are the scrap piles of the social machine.

The hope and the aim of modern penologists is to "turn these scrap piles into repair shops" where as large a percentage as possible of the output may be turned from human liabilities to social assets. Practical penology should be a kind of salvage business designed to contribute its small share toward getting human society out of the red.

The classical conception that men are possessed of wills wholly free and that the "punishment must fit the crime" is or should have been buried long ago. The Lombrosian theory that criminals are a special kind of people has long since become untenable. *Criminals are maladjusted people.* Prisoners are maladjusted people who have been caught and convicted of breaking the law. Ninety-five per cent of all prisoners leave prison sooner or later and many of them more badly adjusted than before—to commit more and bigger crimes.

The very words penitentiary, reformatory, and correctional institution are evidence that, in philosophy at least, we have believed for a great many years that penal institutions have a reformative and correctional function. We have been committed to the principle that we must accept the idea of adjustment rather than the Mosaic Law of an "eye for an eye . . ."

The widespread introduction of new devices and techniques for dealing with prisoners during the past twenty years is definite evidence of a change toward realism and social-mindedness both in our fundamental philosophy and in our practices.

Careful studies of the heterogeneous nature of the prison population have made it evident that two kinds of specialization are necessary in penal organizations. The first trend is toward a specialization by institutions on the ground that it is not logical to assume that the same institution and the same staff are equipped to treat at once the alcoholic, the drug addict, the psychotic, the neurotic, the psychopathic, the crippled, the sick, the brutalized, the weak, the young, the old, the amenable and the vicious. The Federal Bureau of Prisons and a number of our more populous states have diversified the functions of their several institutions for such purposes as: initial classification, treatment of the insane, the feebleminded, the handling of habitual and hardened criminals, the education and training of juvenile delinquents, medical centers for the treatment of the sick, special hospitals for drug addicts, farm colonies for chronic alcoholics and vagrants, and medium security institutions for the hopeful cases.

The second type of specialization involves the study of individual inmates within a given institution. This technique of case study of inmates has come to be called classification. Most modern penal institutions now have a classification board made up of the administrative and professional heads of the institution. Its purpose is to make a complete factual study of each case received in the institution. And as a result of legal, social, criminal, occupational, medical, neuro-psychiatric, educational, and custodial facts brought out in this study, the Board determines what disposition, in the way of treatment or program, each individual prisoner should follow. The fundamental concept upon which this technique rests is that each individual prisoner is a special case requiring special study and analysis, and individual treatment based upon the maladjustment found in his case. This is in direct opposition to the old practices of mass treatment. It is probably one of the most significant developments in the technique of prison administration to appear in this generation. Its approach is professional, its techniques are those of science, and its judgments have the merit of being uncolored by personal prejudice.

More and more institutions are accepting the idea that the whole prison program, if it is to be rehabilitative in its results, must adopt a philosophy of education. Educational activities in institutions for juveniles have long been accepted, and at the present time adult education classes of various kinds are common in all types of prisons and reformatories. A few institutions have

*An address before the annual meeting of the American Council of Guidance and Personnel Associations. Mr. McGee is Warden of the Rikers Island Penitentiary, New York City.

been successful in setting up functioning programs of vocational education and while we are faced with great obstacles in this particular sphere, there can be no question about the general acceptance of the belief that vocational training, for those who can profit thereby, is one of the fundamental necessities in a rehabilitative penal program.

Recreation in penal institutions has been looked upon as a soft-headed and coddling procedure by many uninformed persons. Knowing as we do, however, that most people who get into trouble with the law do so during their leisure time, and knowing also that without a recreational program in an institution, inmates may be seriously damaged physically, mentally, and morally by their incarceration, we are committed to an organized, professionally supervised program of recreation for all institutions. Where such programs are established and operating under skilled direction, they stand out in striking contrast to the desultory, disorganized, and unmoral leisure-time activities of prison inmates of former days.

The value of useful and purposeful work in the development of character and personality has long been recognized. While a generation ago, even though the professional and more enlightened aspects of penal treatment were largely neglected, most prisons were teeming workshops engaged in not only maintaining the activities necessary to routine life in the institution, but also in the manufacture of economically valuable industrial products such as shoes, clothing, soap, furniture, and the like. Today because selfish employers and labor unions have recognized and resented the competition of prison-made products, no matter whether sold to private or public agencies, legislation and political pressure have been used to seriously damage these prison industries. For this reason, literally tens of thousands of able-bodied prisoners who would be glad of the opportunity to work are now lying idle under the most unregenerative conditions, or are engaged in useless "busy work" which engages neither their interest nor their respect. While we are committed to a program of useful work for prisoners, we are at the present time in desperate need of public support and intelligent official action in eliminating this uneconomical and unsocial scourge of prison idleness.

Many prisoners are in prison because of straightforward maladjustments in their relationships with families, jobs, and the like. The introduction of professional social workers to the staff of a few penal institutions was made with great trepidation only a decade ago. Administrators were frequently afraid to call them by their right titles. At first they were known as morale officers, welfare officers, and wardens' assistants. Now, however, the practical value of the trained social worker in making social adjustments among prisoners and their families is fairly well established. An officer engaged full or part time in such activities will soon be found in all modern well-managed penal and correctional institutions.

One of the first professional services ever provided for prison inmates was that of the prison chaplain. For inmates religiously inclined, as many of them are, the right kind of a chaplain can often contribute the thing which is needed to bring about a readjustment.

One of the most phenomenal changes which is taking place in some of our better institutions is the improvement of the medical service.

Not many years ago, it was not uncommon practice to assign insane inmates to rock piles and similar work and beat them into insensibility if they became recalcitrant. Such surgery as was absolutely necessary was often carried out under the most primitive conditions. Little or no attention was paid to the segregation of active venereal and tubercular cases. It has also been common to give little or no attention to the segregation or treatment of the psycho-sexual. No professional attention was given to the food or to the general sanitation of the institution. These and hundreds of other less glaring shortcomings of the old type of institution are rapidly receiving skilled professional attention. The institution which I represent has a 250-bed hospital in addition to out-patient clinics such as venereal, psychiatric, general medical, and dental which administer several thousand treatments per week. Physical deficiencies which can be corrected by medical science are often found to be the basis for delinquency. This, as well as the necessity for dealing with a public health problem wherever it may be found, fully justifies a modern and well-staffed medical program in every institution.

The professional aspect of the program, however, will be largely ineffective if not incorporated in an integrated administrative organization. The great need in most of our institutions today is for improvement in the quality of the rank and file employee as well as for an honest, intelligent, and socially-minded attitude on the part of the executive officers in charge.

It is difficult to demonstrate statistically that this newer type of prison program contributes a great deal to the cure of crime. However, examination of a few individual cases where marked readjustments have been made, may help to illustrate its positive values.

Mike, a red-headed Irish immigrant and father of four children, two years ago was serving his tenth sentence in five years for wife beating. He had committed no other crime and had a good work record as a "sand hog" in tube construction. His wife was a shrew and Mike was sensitive. When things got too unbearable Mike would put on his hat, go out to the corner saloon and get drunk. When he came home, the shrew was more shrewish than ever, and Mike was just as sensitive and had fewer inhibitions. The result, another trip to jail. After a talk with Mike, he was advised that, in spite of his love for his children and his religious scruples against divorce, it would be unwise for him to attempt to live with his wife any longer. A short time ago, I received a letter from Mike which read in part as follows:

> . . . Thanks for your help. I have a good job. Haven't seen the old lady since I got out. Getting along swell.

Sam, a forty-three-year-old thief of Hebrew origin had served time in a dozen or more jails and penitentiaries. For a period of seventeen years he had never been out of jail longer than six months at a time. In the institution he was a behavior problem, constantly getting into trouble with other inmates and with his officers. Upon examination it was found that he had a thyroid condition which the medical department believed could be corrected by surgical intervention. Sam was glad to coöperate, and after the operation seemed like a man born again. His attitude and outlook on life had changed. I saw him a month ago when he appealed to me to help him obtain a divorce from his prostitute wife. He has now been out of prison over

two years, is making $45.00 a week, and is so pleased with himself that he feels he must tell the whole world about it.

Dick was an intelligent, thirty-three-year-old American prisoner serving his third sentence for petty larceny, involving the passing of bad checks. He had arthritis of both feet and at the time of his admission to the institution was barely able to walk with crutches. He had convinced himself that he was done for, particularly because of his crippled condition. After a long stay at the hospital under careful treatment he was finally cured to the extent of being able to walk with a slight limp. He still had no faith in himself, however. He finally became interested while in prison in Christian Science which seemed to improve his mental outlook. After having been out of the institution for two and one-half years, I received word concerning him only last week. He is doing well physically and is now the manager of one of New York's successful moving picture theatres.

Tommy is an undersized twenty-year-old boy from New York's lower East Side. He was brought up under the most unfavorable social circumstances. He has always been a behavior problem and his difficulties have been attributed both by himself and his family to the fact that he was cross-eyed. Because of this deformity, he tried to act like a tough guy in order to compensate for the kidding he received at the hands of his playmates and associates. At Rikers Island, a medical operation was performed which resulted in the complete straightening of his eyes. He has been seeing the psychiatrist weekly and while it is still too early to predict his future, a complete personality change seems to have taken place in this individual.

Sam Smith, a thirty-eight-year-old colored man who was born in the South, has been in jail a number of times for petty offenses and is now serving a penitentiary sentence for assault. He is of low average intelligence, but had never learned to read or write. He felt this deficiency keenly and reacted to it in a paranoid manner. He believed that because he was "dumb," as he puts it, everyone was trying to put one over on him. His reactions to these beliefs were belligerent. He has been assigned to the institutional school where he has progressed to a fifth-grade level. He feels now that he was wrong, that people are not interested in putting anything over on him. And he is convinced that when he goes out he will be able to get a job and stay out of trouble.

There are hundreds of other cases in my own personal experience, and in the experience of every prison man, which demonstrate that prisons may and do assist in personal adjustments where other agencies have failed. That there are numerous cases in which we do no good and some in which we do a great deal of harm, I am frank to admit. But this is also true of the schools, the churches, homes, and all other social institutions. We have more than our share of handicaps. We are dealing with adults whose habits are more or less rigidly fixed. We lack public support for some of the things we are trying to do. We need changes in our laws for numerous reasons. We need more money, better staffs, and freedom from political influences. In spite of all this, correctional institutions which are under good management are contributing far more to the personal adjustment of their inmates than is generally supposed. In truth, the only sound social justification for their existence is the readjustment of their inmates.

Some Meditations on Visiting the Fair*

I—Man Is a Maker of Things

A. POWELL DAVIES

Undeniably, the New York World's Fair is an impressive spectacle. No one can visit it without responding in one degree or another to its lavish magnificence. And it is all man-made. Even the very ground you walk on has been manufactured—and there is an awful lot of it. Everywhere is the evidence of triumphant fabrication. Building after building houses ingenious demonstrations of an all but incredible human inventiveness. Whatever the world of tomorrow may be, the world of today is very clever. Beyond the shadow of a doubt, modern man is a wonderful maker of wonderful things.

Not only can you talk across thousands of miles of continent and ocean as easily as you can speak across a room, but you can also have your solo voice electrically scrambled into a vocal quartet, thus increasing four-fold your pleasure in hearing yourself talk. If you desire it, your clothes may be made from milk and no matter what the cut or color, they will not curdle or even turn sour. If for any reason you hesitate to subject yourself to the gentle hazards of bodily transit at breakneck speed in order to put in an appearance somewhere, you can substitute the transmission of yourself in semblance by television across a city or by similar device across a country. And all this is no more than the merest trifle, for the sum of present achievements and the future of human inventiveness add up to something which staggers comprehension and leaves the brain reeling. This, if you did not already know it, you soon discover at the Fair.

Yet, when you think about it, no matter how hard you try, you find it impossible to be comfortably edified. From nowhere at all, it seems, an undertone of irony creeps in. Looking at the Trylon, you observe that it is very tall, looks much the same from any of its three sides, and means nothing. Glancing at the Perisphere, you notice that it is very large and very round and has been made in such a way that nothing seems to be stopping it from rolling away. This is a pleasant deception, yet you could endure to be without it. When you enter the Perisphere, you see below you a model city bathed in gloom. As you progress on a sort of endless belt, momentary daylight (artificial) struggles inconclusively with circumambient dark. Probably, this arrangement is not intended to mean that the world of tomorrow will be blanketed in night; more likely, it is for the purpose of emphasizing the prettiness of the artificial

*The first of two remarkable articles on the New York World's Fair. The second article will be published in the next issue. Mr. Davies is minister of the Community Church in Summit, New Jersey.—*Editor.*

stars in the artificial sky. Coming out from the Perisphere into the sunlight, you reflect that though the intraperispheric experience did not mean very much, neither did it last very long, and after all the cost was only twenty-five cents.

Once outside, you stand on a high vantage-point and pause to take a full view of the Fair. If you had formed the intention of "seeing" most of it, this view is rather discouraging and calculated to modify your ambition. As realization grows, all your bones, muscles, and sinews are seized by anticipatory fatigue. A little help in this direction is opportunely suggested, however, when from below you hear six notes of a well-known New York folksong. These notes come from a conveyance provided for the purpose of letting you see most of the outside of everything in the shortest possible time. While you travel, you have the additional advantage of being able to hear the six notes of the song repeated over and over again. They seem to say, "Don't take the Fair too seriously! It's only meant to be Fun!" But is it?

The trouble is that no one knows how to take the Fair at all. The longer he is in it and the more he thinks about it, the more confounded his confusion becomes. The true keynote of the Fair is bewilderment. Man, the maker of all this wonderful world of representation, walks his pedestrian way with tired feet, in and out amongst it. He does not know what he is seeing, there is too much of it, it is too intricate, and it makes him very weary. What does it mean?—this world within a world which dwarfs the men who built it? Is it something for man or only something which goes with men? Is it real or just a dream? What does it mean that in this man-made world, mankind itself must go its weary way, bewildered and footsore, alien and lonely, forever losing its way?

Machinery, fabrication, multiplied resource, arrangement, organization, power, and skill—but what is there behind it all and in it all? What is there of man himself, of essential human life and human living? After all, we are so little accustomed even to the precarious human distinction of standing on two legs that our backs ache from a little looking at the "World of Tomorrow." Most of the people to be seen at the Fair are sitting down. They look as though that is what they want to do more than anything else. They may be joyfully meditating upon the World of Tomorrow, of course, but they look as if they were just sitting down. Some of them look as though there is nothing that they will ever want to do again anywhere except sit down. Is it a parable? . . .

And what shall we say of the men who make wonderful things? How many of them do it from love of it? Or to go somewhere or to create something? And how many take a little leaden part in it, only to procure the means to make an hour or so of every day their own, secure to the quiet uses of a hearthside, its simplicity and peace? How many work at the making of wonderful things, buoyed only by the hope of a day in the country with green grass and tall trees and a blue sky? How much more human is man because of all that is represented at the Fair? How much more alive is he? How much more joy or peace is in his heart? Is he happier? Or just more restless in the hope of being happy some time?

How much of this wonderful man-made world can man have, anyway? How many men will share in it? The world is still a large place with many people in it. How many of these people can own wonderful things? Use wonderful inventions? Ease the lifelong labor of earning the right to live?

And what shall we say of the ingeniousness of an age so inventive that it finds the labor of millions of men superfluous while the cost of their unemployment is disastrous? We cannot find a way to get enough of the wonderful things we make into the hands of the people who might use them. Is it too much to say that here is a fact which is almost a cancellation of anything the Fair might mean? Are we masters of what we have made? Or slaves of it? Does the World of Wonderful Things work for us or we for it?

The physically most impressive building at the Fair, the Russian Pavilion, says that the answer to these questions is Socialism. But when the building is visited, very little can be found out about Socialism. What begins as Socialism seems very quickly to become Stalinism. Ordinary modern men cannot help feeling that the two are not quite the same thing. The solution of problems by Stalinism can now only be entertained with deep misgivings, not because of what the Russian building features but because of what it would beguile us to forget. Nor is the visitor much helped by his pilgrimage to Magna Charta (which is not featured in India), nor by his interest in Liberty, Equality, Fraternity (Dinner, $15 a couple, ten days' notice for reservations). There may be gleams of light here and there but they are fitful and few. No one could find his way by them. The World's Fair is irrelevant. That is the word. Irrelevant!

The forces which are shaking the world of today and moulding the world of tomorrow are not featured at the Fair. In fact, though quite nice, the Fair is quite unimportant. It is a sort of cultural fungus growing out of the roots of modern life, nurtured by them but not belonging to them. Presently, it will be swept away, leaving hardly a trace.

Rainier

[Dedicated to J. H. Smith]

Rainier,
Ancient deity of man;
Sky-dweller of the coast!
Glorious now in snow and ice;
Gorgeous in the sun's last light;
Careless of little man,
Riding his toys about thy feet;
Extinct the flame that made thee god!
Serene art thou in frozen might!

Feeling is for us who gaze on thee,
And strive to paint thy grace sublime,
Thy strength, thy calm surpassing time.
The sun that guilds thy height with gold,
Acclaims and worships thee,
As man struck dumb in awe
Once felt his spirit rise in prayer,
Thou Mountain-That-Was-God.

HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER

"Union Now"—of How Many?

HENRY W. PINKHAM

"Toward a New Earth," by Tracy D. Mygatt, (UNITY, June 19), creates additional interest in Clarence K. Streit's *Union Now* and its advocacy of a federation of fifteen democracies. Despite Miss Mygatt's unfavorable verdict, in my humble opinion Mr. Streit's proposal deserves a great deal of further consideration.

I am writing on the Fourth of July while the air is filled with nerve-racking noise through our customary barbarian celebration of the nation's birthday. The childish form of our glorification gives additional point to the inquiry whether our revolution, after all, was wise. I think it was a mistake. Our fathers should have been more patient and reasonable. The thirteen states should have continued to be a part of the British political system. Had this been done, the world would be much nearer today than it is to the fulfillment of the poet's vision of the time

> When the war-drums throb no longer, and the battle-flags are furled
> In the Parliament of Man, the Federation of the World.

Few others in the United States may hold the political heresy I have just avowed, but if so the fact is chiefly because the idea has never even occurred to the generalty. So thoroughly have we all been indoctrinated with the notion that our revolution was great and glorious, noble and sacred! Bunk!

One very great American, at any rate, has held this heresy, namely, that hard-headed realist, that incarnation of practical wisdom, Charles W. Eliot. About the time of our entering the World War he said, as reported in the press, that if there resulted so close a relationship with Britain as virtually to undo the mistake of 1776, this would go a long way toward balancing our burdens and losses by the war. I cannot quote his very words nor now tell where I read them, but I am sure that I have correctly stated their substance, as doubtless various persons who knew him well could corroborate.

This anti-Fourth-of-July lucubration is pertinent to Miss Mygatt's discussion. Peoples with so much in common as the Americans and the British should not have separated politically. And by the same token, today it is the nations that have much in common that should federate first. Miss Mygatt objects to *Union Now* because its proposal covers only fifteen countries and definitely excludes the dictator nations. As if it were not going to be sufficiently difficult to persuade the fifteen democracies to surrender sovereignty to the necessary degree! *Union Now* aims definitely at world federation as its ultimate goal and proposes a very long step in that direction as immediately practicable. This proposal is widely regarded, however, as so remote from reality, so palpably utopian, as to merit no serious consideration. With what words, then, will practical folk characterize Miss Mygatt's insistence that straightway we undertake to organize on the pattern of our federal system all the nations of the earth?

Mr. Streit says that none of the fifteen democracies he lists has been at war with any other one of them for the last hundred years—which, in the case of Ireland's relation to Great Britain, looks like a stretching of the truth. He says also that none of the fifteen today fears attack by any other one or more of them. There must be a considerable measure of mutual confidence on the part of nations before they will be willing to give up even in part that sovereignty on which, through general miseducation and false patriotism, they now pride themselves. That is why a federal organization must begin with countries selected for their fitness for the great experiment. To try at this time, in the present state of the world, to include all the nations seems to me preposterous beyond words.

Hamilton Holt has been called the father of the League of Nations. He was editor of the *Independent* in which, some time before the World War began, he proposed and effectively advocated that nations enlightened enough to pledge never to go to war against one another should pool their armaments for common defense against aggression on the part of any nation, or possible group of nations, not thus enlightened. Nations so agreeing could reduce their individual armaments, since the strength of all of them would be available for the defense of any one of them if attacked. When an outside nation became wise enough to seek entrance into the league, and showed its sincerity by its willingness to disarm proportionately, then all the members of the league could reduce their armaments correspondingly. The goal of this process would be complete world disarmament which would be achieved when the last nation joined the league. This plan was based on mutual trust on the part of the nations adopting it. Unfortunately, the League of Nations that was organized after the war was in theory all-inclusive. As President Wilson stated, sanctions were necessary because certain countries could not be trusted to keep their word. Suspicion and fear have played the devil with the league. The victors did not dare to disarm as they had promised. The vanquished have rearmed, and hell is yawning wide.

The lesson is plain. Let the nations that can and do trust one another abandon the sovereignty that was always an evil and that modern modes of transportation and communication have made an absurdity, and enter a federal system patterned on the United States. There are such nations, and the time is ripe for them to unite. But let us drop the notion of including the dictator countries in the union. Let them first qualify by achieving a definite minimum of democracy, the only kind of government worthy of mature and civilized human beings.

When Nights Are Dark

When nights are dark then I can see
The gentle Jew of Galilee.
I see him walking calm and brave
Setting each foot upon a wave.
He does not heed the depths below,
He does not fear the winds that blow.
His eyes invite, "Come, walk with me
Across the lake to Galilee."

RITA KISSIN.

Pioneering in Religious Thinking

JOHN H. HERSHEY

Are we liberals pioneering in religious thinking? Or are we assuming that the day of pioneering is over? Is it for us merely to accept the tradition of past liberals? The answer is that we need to continue to advance in religious thinking. If we advance, then indeed we are carrying on the basic tradition of the great liberals of the past. That tradition is not so much any particular ideas about man or God, as it is the spirit of free search and inquiry in order to find the truth. Thus we must clearly distinguish between the tradition of free inquiry and the tradition of specific beliefs. To carry on the liberal tradition is to have this free spirit in our time also; it does not mean necessarily that we hold to all the beliefs that former liberals have formulated in their search for truth. This is why it is consistent to have differences of opinion within a liberal church or denomination. Thus, by pioneering in religious thinking we mean, first, that we continue the spirit of intellectual freedom; and, secondly, that we also formulate for our time beliefs that seem reasonable. Indeed, if we accept the tradition of the free mind, we are logically bound to be pioneers in our thinking of man and the universe.

There are two important directions which we as progressives can take. One way in which we can pioneer is in our attitude toward building a better human society. Another way is in our attitude toward the universe. Let us first consider the former.

Saving the world from its many evils by the method of individuals reforming themselves has been and still is the attitude of many liberals. The slogan, "salvation by character," illustrates this point of view. Evils of today, such as juvenile delinquency, exploitation of workers, and war are to be corrected by each individual developing his own character. A peaceful world is to be brought about by each person in the nations achieving the spirit of unselfishness in his own soul. If a better world is to come in the varied relationships of human life, then it will come only or mainly through the development of individual hearts. Human society can be saved, if at all, by individual reform. This is the attitude that seems to be held by many liberals.

What shall we, who endeavor to be pioneers in religious thinking in our time, say of this point of view? Certainly, persons of intelligence and sympathy are needed to manage any social system. Certainly, the leaders of labor, industry, government, and international relations should be those who are guided by knowledge and inspired by good will. The method of individuals reforming themselves is necessary. What follows is not intended to deny this important truth.

But it is not enough. What is emphatically needed is also the reforming of social conditions and the building of a new and better economic, political, and social order. It must be understood that a close relationship between the individual and social conditions does exist. Neither the individual nor society is a static, unchanging thing. On the contrary, individuals change; society, too, is changing and evolving. Therefore, there is a continuous, vital relationship existing between individuals and social conditions. Individuals, especially leaders, help change conditions. Conditions and institutions, in turn, influence the mass of people. Individual leaders, for example, create consumer coöperatives, labor unions, group medicine, churches. These social institutions then influence their members. There is continuous interaction between individuals and institutions, each changing the other. Therefore, in order to bring about the Kingdom of Heaven on earth, it is absolutely essential that not only individuals reform themselves, but that social conditions be changed.

Let us consider some examples illustrating this truth. If juvenile delinquency is to be prevented more than it has been in the past, not merely individual reform of youth is necessary but especially reform of the evil social conditions that breed such youth. The abolition of slums and the establishment of adequate housing are some of the means that help develop youth.

With regard to another problem, consider the liquor question. It is not enough to endeavor to cure drunkenness by preaching that individuals reform themselves. It is necessary that the conditions that encourage drunkenness be abolished. As to just what shall be done, good and wise persons differ. But can there be any question as to the need for some kind of attack on conditions? Whether the method be that of rigid regulation of private traffic in liquor or abolition of all liquor advertisements or the establishment of state stores or prohibition is another question. But that conditions in many parts of our country need to be changed is certainly evident.

Economic depressions bring both material and spiritual misery to millions of people. It is important but not enough to urge employers to be generous with their employees and fair to the public, or to urge employees to coöperate with business. Depressions will still come if nothing else is done. There must be a change of conditions; only then is there some hope that depressions will end. Just what changes should be made is a matter about which people differ. But whether it be a minor or drastic change of the capitalistic system, or the establishment of a different economic system, some change in conditions that breed depressions is necessary. Not merely individuals, but the economic order itself must be changed.

If we are to have peace among the nations, it is essential but not enough that the peoples of the various nations possess the spirit of good will. It is also necessary that conditions which help to make war be eliminated, and that conditions which help to make it easier to settle disputes be created. Religious progressives must therefore teach that relationships among the nations need to be changed so that war will be discouraged and peace encouraged.

It may be said by some, however, that when a church teaches the need of social action and reform, it is then "mixing in politics." If by that phrase is meant the giving of support by the church to a political party or candidate, then the church certainly should not mix in politics. It would be as difficult, as well as undesirable, for a church to have all of its members belong to a particular party, as it would be for a political party to have all of its members adhere to a particular church. But some liberals seem to mean that churches should not even discuss and study in pulpit and classes the great social issues from an ethical point of view. If mixing in politics means doing these things, then churches should certainly mix in politics! If we are to build the

Kingdom of Heaven on earth, then it is absolutely necessary that social action and reform be taught as means to that glorious fulfillment.

As pioneers in religious thinking in our time, we must therefore advance beyond the teaching that reforming individuals is enough to bring about a better world, to the attitude that reforming conditions and establishing a new and better economic, political, and social order are necessary. Let our slogan be, "salvation by character and social action." Liberal religion thus becomes more than something merely personal and subjective; it becomes social and objective. Holding fast to this social conception, liberal religion can arouse fervor and be practical in everyday life. Loyalty to the great purpose of establishing a new social order, a Kingdom of Heaven on earth, becomes a driving power in our being. The day of liberal religion is not done, and the distinction between liberals and conservatives still remains, if we emphasize the religion of devotion to the building of a new and better social order for men, women, and children.

Progressive religion, as we have seen, should go beyond the individual to the social. It is vitally necessary that religion means our deep concern and effort for a humane social order. But even this is not enough. There are still wider horizons than the individual or even humanity. There are universal and cosmic horizons. Liberal religion needs to be cosmic in scope, needs to open our souls to the wonder and glory and beauty of the living universe. Unfortunately, however, some liberals think of religion as being social only, ignoring the universal elements. Some, on the other hand, think of religion as being only the worship of the Infinite, ignoring the social aspects. A fully-rounded religion takes in both the social and the universal. Therefore, let us consider in what way we can be pioneers in our attitude toward the universe.

The knowledge achieved by scientists suggests that this amazing and complex universe is nevertheless a unity. The science of the stars discloses an orderly system in which the earth, the other planets, and the sun form a pattern. Furthermore, our solar system is but a part of the great galaxy of stars we call the Milky Way. Also our galaxy is but one of millions of galaxies which together form the supergalaxy or universe. That space and time are bound together, that gravitation extends to the vast reaches of space, that evolution of stars and systems occurs through time, that light rays speed through space bringing light from distant stars to our eyes—all these facts point to the sublime thought of the unity of all things.

The sciences of matter indicate that the atomic elements form definite patterns, and that they evolved somehow from one primordial element. The science of life makes plausible the proposition that all living things are united in the sense that all are made of the same fundamental protoplasm. Ethnology shows that it is highly probable that all existing races of mankind sprang originally from one common stock. Many of the different schools of psychology are based on the idea of the intimate relation between the body and the mind of the human being. History and sociology show the interchange of trade and culture ever going on among diverse nations and races.

Thus, this complicated, mysterious world of atoms and earth and man and stars is nevertheless a unity. From all these conclusions of science it is reasonable to assume the reality of a cosmic order, a universal life. By the term "cosmic order" is meant the pattern and organization of the whole universe in space. The term "universal life" signifies the processes ever going on in the vast universe of time. This cosmic order and universal life constitutes one eternal reality which is God.

The various sciences also make reasonable the thought that we human beings, as well as all living things, are rooted in the universe as a tree is rooted in the soil of the earth. Physically, we are made of the same elemental stuff as the earth and the stars. Biologically, we are bound together to all living things on this planet. It is probable that life itself sprang somehow from what we call matter. Historically, the human race is bound together in what is very likely a common origin. Our conscience relates us to our group and even to humanity, for ideas of right and wrong have evolved among human beings in the process of their living together. Our aesthetic sense binds us to the sights and sounds of beauty that are around us. There is a relation between our sense of beauty and the world which contains beautiful objects. Our brains have evolved in this universe; and when we discover its laws, we are related through understanding with the system and law of nature.

The knowledge thus far gained by man makes reasonable the idea of a universal life, a cosmic order, which is God. Furthermore, as we have just seen, knowledge makes probable the thought that our whole being—physical, mental, social, and spiritual—is rooted in the process and structure of the universe itself, in the cosmic reality we call God. Therefore, as pioneers in religious thinking, we can develop this thought of God and our relation to God.

The affirmative idea of God has thus far been advanced. The idea presented here is opposed to two other attitudes toward the universe, which shall be considered briefly. In the first place, the universe is not alien to man. If our whole being is part and parcel of living reality, then we can hardly think of the universe as alien to us. In the second place, God is not a personal providence over the individual or even over humanity. God is not a personal providence conceived as being either transcendent or indwelling. Liberals used to debate with Trinitarians the question whether Deity is one person or three persons. The basis of argument is surely changing now. The discussion is becoming more and more whether God can properly be considered a personal providence at all. The question is whether Deity is a personal providence or the superpersonal cosmic order. Thus according to the thought of God suggested in this article, the universe is not alien to us; God is not a personal providence; but God is the universal life, and our lives are rooted in that life.

From a practical point of view, how can we attain this cosmic consciousness, this awareness of the sublime, eternal unity of all things? To absorb the truths of the sciences so that we not merely understand but also feel their meaning, is an aid. Music may help us in giving us a sense of the rhythmic universe. Paintings, such as those of the artist Roerich, may enlarge our horizons. Observing with appreciation the earth and sea and sky and the multitude of living creatures is another way to attain consciousness of the eternal beauty. As sincere worshippers in a church we may be "led unto the thinking of the thought divine." As

citizens of the living universe, we are aware not only of ourselves and of humanity, but also of the order of things which includes us but vastly more. Liberal and progressive religion, then, can open men's minds and hearts to the wide horizons of the universe, can make us feel wonder and awe in the presence of sublimity, can help us feel that we are part of "one stupendous whole." The indescribable beauty of the cosmos is, for the modern man, the glory of God. To achieve a vision of God is to partake of one of the greatest experiences possible to human beings.

We as liberals and progressives in religion can carry on the great tradition of free search and inquiry according to experience, science, reason. But in possessing that spirit today, we may arrive at conclusions about man and God that are different from those held in the past. We too must be pioneers in religious thinking. In our continued quest, two directions in which we can move have been suggested. Pioneering in our thought of man, we come to the conclusion that we must preach and practice reform not only of individuals, but also of conditions and the social system. Pioneering in the thought of God, we come to the conclusion that the universal life and beauty and order is God. The day of the liberal church is not done if we continue to be pioneers of a vital religion.

Horse Sense

MAY STRANATHAN

Starting one morning to the courthouse to pay my taxes I found the public square before it filled with a crowd of people gathered to watch the circus parade then passing, and traffic at a standstill for some thirty minutes or more. Next to the sidewalk on a side street I found a bench, deserted by those who sought a closer view of the passing show. Here I sat down facing the back of a truck which had been wedged in close to the sidewalk. In the truck were a half-dozen fine looking horses. The driver stood on the seat of the truck looking at the parade, to which his passengers seemed indifferent. Two of these horses stood looking over the back of the truck, their heads being but a few feet above mine, so that I heard all that passed between them. One was a fine-appearing gelding and the other a filly of a light sorrel shade. They seemed interested in each other, but oblivious of my presence.

Any four-footed animal riding in a truck always strikes me as an absurd and incongruous sight. Perhaps this is but my reflex to the scenes of my childhood when I was accustomed to seeing droves of horses, cattle, sheep, or hogs go through our little town on their way to market. Long before day, the drovers would be up and out into the country, and many a morning I was awakened at early dawn by the neighing of horses, the lowing of cattle, the bleating of sheep, or the grunting of pigs, as well as the hallooing of the drovers as they sought to keep their charges in the road or galloped to the front to head off and return to the fold any who had broken from the line. Many a morning I have jumped out of bed at these sounds and run to window or door to watch the passing animals on their way to the stock pen to be loaded on the little tickle-bender train for their unknown destination.

As I indulged in such memories, forgetting the circus and its spectators, I heard an impatient neigh from the truck, and looking up I saw the gelding shudder as it saw a truckload of hogs worming its way into the empty space made by an outgoing car. Then the gelding spoke to the filly thus:

"This is simply unendurable. What does that policeman mean by allowing that load of hogs to crowd in here? Transportation by bus service was never meant for hogs anyway. They should be kept on the ground where they belong. If they do not know their place, at least their owners should know enough not to force such lowbrows into the company of their betters. You have doubtless heard the saying that you cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear? No more can you make an aristocratic and intelligent being out of a hog by hauling it around in an automobile. It is by nature a plodding, gross, and grovelling beast. Even the Bible says the hog is unfit for food—and then, the smell!" Here the gelding tried to turn up its nose in disgust, but, being of the acquiline type, it failed to register its owner's feelings except by a slight wrinkling.

"But do you not remember what Charles Dudley Warner said about the pig?" asked the filly, who, when I observed her closer, had a refined and even intellectual look, "that it is not by nature a low and filthy beast, but has been forced into its present state by the pride and cruelty of man. Once it occupied the cottage of the poor Irish peasant, along with the family, but now it is condemned to a dirty sty with no other means of cleaning itself than a mud bath. Besides," she continued in a conciliatory tone, "there is no better eating, I am told, than a slice of pink, tender ham. Of course I mean food for humans only, no horse would be expected to touch it. But I confess I enjoyed the smell of it when just now our driver brought back a ham sandwich from the drugstore."

"So are chickens considered good to eat by men, with their vitiated taste," replied the gelding. "But the sight of a coop of filthy fowls makes me actually sick. Each animal should know the place for which the Creator intended it, and should keep to that place. It is flying in the face of Providence to do otherwise," and he put on a sanctimonious air. The filly looked thoughtful and did not venture a reply for two minutes. Then she said, timidly:

"Do you think there was ever such a being as a cockhorse? You know those old pictures of the horse with wings and the head of a cock, and the old nursery rhyme about riding one to Banbury Cross."

"Of course not," replied her companion, with a scornful toss of his head. "How can you ask such a foolish question? It is nothing but a fable, a foolish fable and a slander on the noblest of all animals, the horse. Besides that nursery doggerel does not rhyme."

"And the hippogriff and the centaur," continued the filly, "are they too but fables?"

"Of course they are but fables, and the coarsest kind of fables. If there was ever such a combination as horse and man in nature, the horse would undoubtedly be on top and the man below."

"That would look very queer," said the filly, pensively, "and I certainly would not like being carried around on two legs."

"I should say not," replied the gelding, "I do not see how any self-respecting horse can imagine such a freak as a centaur. When I think of the difference in grace of movement between the horse with its four perfectly balanced legs and the tottering gait of man with but two, I am filled with indignation to remember how many centuries the horse has been compelled to drag the plow for man, to haul his heavy loads through mud up to the hub of the wagon, to feel the whip of his cruel master on his back while struggling up some stony hillside, with the man, his wife, and children sitting at ease behind him. But I now laugh to myself whenever a truck in which I am riding stalls and the driver has to get down and roll around in the dirt under it, while I stand in dignified silence over him. I feel the hardships suffered by my ancestors are being avenged."

"Not fully," returned the filly, sadly, "you must know there are still many of our unfortunate brothers and sisters who still do the heavy work for men."

"True, but we are in a transition period now. More and more every day electricity is doing the dirty work, and the horse is being freed from his toil and sweat of centuries to take his rightful place as the being of which Job speaks as mocking at fear, afraid of nothing, not even of battle as he smelleth it from afar. And you surely have read how Zechariah speaks of horses as the spirits of the heavens which go forth from standing before the Lord."

"But what will become of us if all the horses are slain in war?" asked the filly. "What will become of us if our daily task is taken from us? Will we not be doomed to extinction?"

"Not at all. Such talk is but the lying propaganda of the automobile salesmen. No, the horse is being freed from drudgery for the higher life from which he was intended by the Creator. Every year we see more and more racing stables, and more and more parades for all manner of causes. I look forward to the day when the horse, as richly caparisoned as those ridden by the knights of old, will be the principal feature of these parades. There is a grace and beauty about the horse that no automobile can approach, though you drape it with gaudy bunting and fill it with wilting flowers. The horse is alive and prancing, thoroughly at home in trappings of silk and velvet, embroidered with purple and gold, his harness of jewel-studded silver and his head crowned with waving plumes as in the days of chivalry. Then will the glory of war be restored and cease to be the disgusting thing of foul trenches and vile-smelling gases to which it has degenerated. When the horse comes into his own he will inspire men to fight their fellows in the open with sword and lance, as he hears the 'thunder of the captains and the shouting.' We will teach men to fight each other instead of sneaking up at night to a city and throwing down bombs on women and children."

There was silence for a while in the back of the truck, both the filly and the gelding being overcome seemingly by the picture painted by the latter. Finally the filly ventured a remark. "I always liked to see a pretty woman on the back of a fine horse, too," she said.

"A fine horse is always a favorite with the ladies," replied her companion with a rather patronizing air. "Beautiful movie actresses and society buds are never so happy as when riding a gallant steed."

"Unless when they are showing off their legs on the beach or the tennis court," remarked the filly. "Why should they be so vain about them, when they have but two apiece while I have four?"

"Why, indeed? And very good looking ones yours are, too," said her companion, at which the filly blushed with pleasure. At least her strawberry nose took on a brighter hue, though it might have been because a ray of the sun struck it just then.

"Yes," continued the horse, mounting his hobby again—if such an expression would not offend him—"the horse is being freed for a nobler and higher life, which is its destiny. Why then should you and I worry if the common breeds of horses should become extinct? The plow horse, the clumsy, hauling Clydesdales and Shires? The horse has by nature much higher qualities than man. There was one man who recognized this and feared not to proclaim it, though in allegory. This man was Jonathan Swift in his story of the visit of Gulliver to the home of the Houyhnhnms. But the ancients, too, recognized the high destiny of the horse, the Greeks as well as the prophets of the Bible. Surely you have heard of Pegasus, the winged horse, the inspiration of the Greek poets?"

"Yes, I have," returned the filly, with some hesitation, "But I feared to speak of it lest you would call it too but a fable, like the centaur and the cockhorse."

"I see, my young friend, you have not yet learned to discriminate between fable and truth," replied the gelding. "The story of Pegasus is not a fable, but a prophecy."

Just then the crowd began to move, the driver started his truck and all further converse between the two was lost in the general noise and confusion. The circus had passed, with its tinsel and gilt, and the crowd was passing. I wended my way into the courthouse, where I found business had been suspended for the rest of the day.

The Study Table

Vital Theatre

THE CHANGING WORLD IN PLAYS AND THEATRE. *By Anita Block.* 449 *pp. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.* $2.75.

I shall never forget those stimulating hours spent in the lecture-room of the New School for Social Research where Anita Block held forth on drama and playwrighting. The easy informality of her classroom technique, her quiet manner of directing discussion, her unquestionable mastery of material, her always enlightening interpretations—all these make the memories of those hours stand out as experiences of high meaning.

It was here that I first made my acquaintance with the author of *The Changing World in Plays and Theatre,* a book which I believe is going to find a unique place in the contemporary literature of the theatre. For Mrs. Block in discussing the modern and contemporary theatre—and she makes an interesting distinction between the adjectives "modern" and "contemporary"—speaks as one who has authority and not as the "scribes." She does not write as a hard-boiled critic

with one eye on box-office receipts and the other on the pay check, but rather as one who not only knows but also loves the theatre. She writes not only as a teacher of drama, but also as a popular critic and lecturer, and as the reader of foreign plays for the Theatre Guild. All these personal references mean that she brings to her task an intimacy of knowledge, a critical insight, and a sense of values as unusual as it is capable of expressing itself in readable and convincing phrase and argument.

If a writer wishes to be certain of immediately arousing the interest of his readers with a book of this sort, let him begin with a provocative thesis, one that at once intrigues and challenges; this is what Mrs. Block does when in her introductory chapter she develops her fascinating idea of "vital theatre" by which she means theatre which deals "with matters that are essential to life in any given epoch," or "plays which furnish commentary, interpretation, illumination and criticism" of their epoch, or again, theatre which "integrates audiences with the age in which they live."

You may not agree with such definitions of the theatre, or even of "vital theatre"; you may find her argument regarding "play-consciousness versus theatre-consciousness" somewhat belabored and unconvincing, but you cannot deny that here is a book which makes the drama of the last two generations live for us with new and thrilling meaning.

Mrs. Block deals particularly with "contemporary drama," by which she means post-war drama, i.e., the drama of the last twenty-five years. Realizing, however, how deeply both the spirit and technique of this new drama are rooted in the immediately preceding years, she gives the reader an exceedingly enlightening analysis of the "modern" drama as exemplified by such giants of the theatre as Henrik Ibsen, Hauptman, Wedekind, Shaw, Galsworthy, Brieux, Chekhov, and others, names that at once suggest an era when the drama became "social-minded" and when the theatre began to hold up a mirror to a startled and uncomfortable social conscience.

The author's chief interest, as the title indicates, is to show how since Ibsen's day we have had "vital theatre" in the sense that drama and the stage became not only conscious of the world they moved in but also sensitive to their responsibility as instruments of social criticism. One might ask in this connection why certain names so important as those of Strindberg, Suderman, Bjoernson, Andreyev, and others are not even mentioned, and why, for instance, in discussing Galsworthy his *Strife* remains entirely out of the picture, when this play, whatever its merits as literature or theatre may be, surely represents one of the first brave attempts to picture in stirring drama the conflict between capital and labor. This and similar omissions may represent a definite personal taste and choice of the author; but I cannot help feeling that chapter 2, "Modern Foundations of Contemporary Drama," might have fared better if chapter 4, "The Conflict within the Individual," with its chief emphasis upon Eugene O'Neill, had been somewhat shortened. This does not imply in any way a depreciation of this distinguished dramatist's significance for the American theatre, and I suppose the question finally comes down to one of *de gustibus non est disputandum.*

Among the other chapters it is difficult to make a choice as regards particular excellence; they are all done so very well. The chapter dealing with "The Individual in Conflict with Changing Sexual Standards" is a masterpiece of frank statement couched in clear and brave language. It should be made compulsory reading for every censor. To me the book grows most exciting, however, with the chapter on "The Social Conflict," and from here on the author's surely not non-partisan viewpoint as regards economics, politics, and the theatre, appears very clearly, and this fact only adds to the convincing readableness of the book.

In chapters 5 and 6, the well-known as well as the less-known social plays of such dramatists as Ernst Toller, Friedrich Wolf, Jules Romain, and of American authors like Elmer Rice, Maxwell Anderson, Paul Green, and those better known as "the dramatists of the left," John Wexley, Paul Peters, George Sklar, Clifford Odets and others, receive sympathetic interpretation, and one wonders at the skill with which Mrs. Block tells the stories of the plays she mentions, interlarding her narrative with apropos and illuminating excerpts from the texts.

If I find the chapter on "Plays Against War" the least convincing, this may be due to my predilection for this type of play and to my own prejudice in the choice of plays that I would include in this dramatic genre. I find many powerful contemporary anti-war plays omitted in favor of, for instance, *Wings over Europe,* an immensely moving drama of "power" and its abuse, but in my humble opinion surely not "the first true play against war," as Mrs. Block chooses to call it. I also think that Hans Chlumberg's *Miracle at Verdun* rates an even higher estimate as an anti-war play than Mrs. Block grants it, and that this magnificent drama should have been much more amply exploited for the benefit of the reader. However, there can be no quarrel with her enthusiastic treatment of the Holmes and Lawrence anti-war drama, *If This Be Treason,* for which every lover of peace wishes a speedy revival on the stage in these stirring days, and, incidentally, when this revival occurs, this writer hopes that the chief flaw of this otherwise so convincing play, viz., its closing lines, may be rectified; a task for which Mr. Holmes himself is eminently qualified.

When she deals with the plays of Soviet Russia, Mrs. Block again proves, as so frequently throughout this book, how thoroughly she is at home with her subject. This chapter is also a most valuable mine of information regarding a new drama that as yet is only superficially known in our land. Many of the plays here mentioned and discussed are not even available in our larger libraries, and if in this respect Mrs. Block opens the eyes of readers and librarians she will have rendered another service of significance.

The book closes with an appreciative, if not entirely unbiased, evaluation of the Federal Theatre, and those of us who have witnessed some of the thrilling projects of this novel governmental undertaking will incline to agree, I believe, with Mrs. Block's general statement that the most hopeful present answer to the question, "How are the American people to obtain a vital theatre?" lies in the Federal Theatre; and it seems quite fitting, I think, that the review of a book dealing with so many controversial questions should end with a controversial statement of this sort.

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY.

Correspondence

Coughlin and the Catholic Church

Editor of UNITY:

May I be permitted to take exception to your statement in a recent issue of UNITY: "If any man can speak the mind of Rome on Father Coughlin it is John A. Lapp . . ."? This was a reference to a sharp criticism of the priest in a radio address given a short time ago; and you characterize Mr. Lapp as "a distinguished Catholic *layman*." (Italics my own.) That excellent paper *The Commonweal* has printed even more drastic criticism and protest, but it does not claim to speak the mind of Rome. There is only one voice for such speaking and that is a collective one, namely the Roman Catholic hierarchy; and to date, I have not seen any disclaimer from this source of the man who parades as a demagogue and mountebank under a priest's cassock, blatantly Fascistic and anti-everything that admirers of the Catholic religion like to attribute to that faith.

Should we not differentiate between the religious side of Catholicism and its political machinations? The latter phase, always active as reputable historical records testify, seems to some of us to have become particularly menacing not alone in Europe today but right here in our own country. The pro-Fascist attitude of the church may not be a willing choice, born, as it is, of a to-be-expected fear of Communism. The Russian revolution was the destruction of one wing of Catholicism. Enough said! The anti-democratic dictators fear Communism in its political and sociological aspects. What more natural than the joining of issues on the part of religious and political leaders to the end that Communism shall not spread further,—even though their efforts are to be compared to those of King Canute endeavoring to sweep back the sea.

One of our journals of opinion referred very recently to the "Jesuitically-edited *America*," and surely it would appear that its writers speak the mind of their church with a totally different accent than shows in the admirable statements of John A. Lapp of Chicago.

BLANCHE WATSON

New York City

Commenting on Our July 3d Issue

Editor of UNITY:

I was interested in reading Mr. Victor S. Yarros' letter advocating a third term for Mr. Roosevelt. Personally, I feel doubtful about the third term tradition being overthrown, and I have been greatly disappointed in the President in some respects. His approval of the huge armaments we now have to support shows that he is a militarist and contradicts many of the good things he has said about Peace.

Has Mr. Yarros read the article by Stanley High given in the May issue of *Readers Digest* about the way W.P.A. workers were coerced and threatened in the last election into voting the Democratic ticket? It seems to me that these revelations reflect directly on the integrity of the President. I like Attorney-General Murphy and Mr. Ickes, and think that they are stronger supporters of civil liberties than the President. How they rate as pacifists I do not know, but surely the Democratic Party is not so poor as to have only one leader. And what is the matter with Senator LaFollette and Senator Nye on the Republican side, though perhaps they are not rated as Republicans? As there is no real difference that I can see between the Democrats and Republicans, I wish we could have a realignment of parties, with the progressives, liberals, and pacifists on one side and the reactionaries and militarists on the other.

To change the subject slightly, what was meant when, in the course of your editorial on "The Royal Visit: The Personal Side," you said: "One thinks almost with shuddering how different it all would have been in this regard had the King and Queen visited us in earlier years." As I look back on the occupants of the White House—President and Mrs. Cleveland, the Theodore Roosevelts, President Wilson and his two wives, President and Mrs. Hoover, and others—I can think of none who would not have given the King and Queen a gracious, cordial, and dignified welcome, and possibly without the military display which the President thought it necessary to have.

FLORENCE HOGE

Clearwater, Florida

"The Gift of Prophecy"

Editor of UNITY:

I read UNITY with considerable interest and while naturally I find some things that I disagree with as editorial utterance, yet I find many things that I agree with most decidedly and so I am appreciative of the sincerity of UNITY as a publication.

The purpose of this letter is to approve the editorial in the July 17th issue, page 149, "The Gift of Prophecy." Your style of writing is very much the same as my own way of putting over ideas which are contrary to the general trend of mental processes. It is better, I think, to offer a thought or statement than to be dogmatic and in this you have done a fine job by putting prophecy on a practical basis and even the hard-boiled should not criticize. But the best is that when we write in this way, we command respect from a larger audience than when we are too exact or too sure of our ground.

Personally my way in editing, and I have been at it for more than twenty-five years in the same field, is to accept things and "put them in my trial grounds." I reject nothing which has the earmarks of common sense, or squares with my long and active experience. In fact, I am not inclined to reject much of anything as I get older. There are so many unseen things which are developing that it is hardly worthwhile for us to be critical of the ideas of others.

But chiefly what I wanted to write for, was to commend the way in which you have presented a subject which about nine hundred and ninety-nine people out of a thousand would reject as not being common sense.

MADISON COOPER.

Calcium, New York.

The Hem and Haw Club

Editor of UNITY:

It is not quite seven o'clock in the morning. I have been listening in for about fifteen minutes to what I am tempted to designate the "Hem and Haw Club of International Commentators on World Affairs." We have in the United States, as you know, these groups who favor us every Sunday morning with a vast deal of talk and a minimum of frank and clear-cut conversation on world affairs. They remind me every now and then of the clever saying concerning Christopher Columbus—that when he started he didn't know where he was going, when he got there he didn't know where he was, and when he returned he didn't know where he had been.

R. W.

Los Gatos, California.

John Haynes Holmes
Editor

UNITY

Curtis W. Reese
Managing Editor

Introducing UNITY to new readers, we offer a trial subscription of . . .

6 MONTHS for $1.00

A Journal of Free and Critical Opinion

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY. REGULAR SUBSCRIPTION $3.00.

UNITY, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago

Please enter my subscription for a trial period of six months, for which I enclose $1.00.

Name..... Street.....

City..... State.....